ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME 7/12/65	DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).	3. IDENTIFICATION NO.	DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW
ED000305	7037	N.A.	

4. AUTHOR(S): Coral, Max

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: About Monteith: The Monteith Students

6. PUBLICATION TITLE: Graduate Comment

7. EDITOR(S): N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
ORG. Wayne State Univ. Detroit, Michigan
ST.
CITY, STATE
TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE: Wayne State University

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
111	N.A.	June 60	19

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE: YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED: YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED: YES ☐ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT: PROPOSAL ☐ IN-PROGRESS ☐ FINAL ☒ FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR: report

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

programs P-22	humanities S-13	liberal arts O-05	
core curriculum R-36	natural science O-17	specialization Y-11	
general edu. S-00	social studies Y-08	admissions R-07	
		students Y-15	

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

Describes the Monteith program at Wayne State University where students devote half of their curricular effort in the freshman and sophomore years and one-quarter in the junior and senior years to a core curriculum of general education organized to cover three large areas: Natural sciences, social sciences, and the humanities. The remaining time is devoted to courses taken in preparation for a profession or specialty, or to a course of study whose principal goal is a liberal education. Admissions procedures described.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION	20. DIVISION OR DEPT.	21. CONTRACT NO. / PROJECT NO.
	22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT	
	23. DURATION OR PROJECT	U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

IV-2

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

GRADUATE COMMENT

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

IV — 2

VOLUME III, NO. 5 JUNE 1960

IN THIS COMMENT

The easy lip service we pay to the virtue of experimentation sometimes obscures the dreadful responsibility of trying something new--the disquieting, implicit risks. One cannot help but admire the intellectual courage of the new and young faculty of Monteith as it takes on the responsibility and confronts the risks.

Conversation and/about Monteith College emphasizes afresh the complexity of the university in the relationships among its parts. The third paper--the discussion--is, we believe, one of the most interesting documents *Comment* has published. We advance this miniature picture of Monteith not only to inform, but also in the hope of encouraging our colleagues to join this conversation.

Max Coral is professor and chairman of the natural science division of Monteith College, and this year has served as its Acting Director. Prior to this assignment Dr. Coral was a professor of mathematics in the College of Liberal Arts. He is an alumnus of the College of the City of Detroit, and completed his graduate work at the University of Chicago. He joined the staff at Wayne in 1936. ***Richard K. Pope*** is an anthropologist. He has a special interest in American Indians and American popular culture. While at Reed College he was a member of the Student Educational Policy Committee. ***Sally Cassidy*** is a sociologist. She came to Wayne State from the University of Chicago, where she completed her doctoral work. She has taught in France and Canada, and was a Social Science Research Council Fellow at the University of California (Berkeley). Her paper is reprinted from ***Monteith College Social Science Readings, Part IV***. ***George Drury*** was the first director of the Sheil School of Social Studies in Chicago, and he came to Wayne State from Loyola University (Chicago) where he taught philosophy. He, too, is a University of Chicago Ph.D. ***Alfred Stern*** has taught at the University of Michigan and at Minnesota. He has been an advisor to the Democratic National Committee on defense policy. He is particularly interested in the philosophy of science and is currently leading a seminar on the history of law.

Born in India, and having taught there, in England and in this country, ***Dr. Suraj Gupta*** has written a paper which is an interesting supplement, though a fortuitous one, to the Monteith College discussion. Dr. Gupta received his Ph.D.

(Concluded on Page Seventeen)

THE MONTEITH EXPERIMENT
Conversation And/About The College in four parts entitled:
About Monteith
Education as a Style of Conversation
Discussion: Education as a Style of Conversation
Dialogue, Colloquium, Conversation
by Max CORAL, Richard K. POPE, Sally Whelan CASSIDY, George DRURY and Alfred STERN

TECHNICIANS, INTELLECTUALS and the MASSES
The Role of the American University
Suraj N. GUPTA

ART AS RELIGION
The Baptism of Art
Leo KIRSHBAUM

THE UMBRELLA OF TERROR
Economics, Science, International Politics
Max MARK

ED000 305

ABOUT MONTEITH

by MAX CORAL

When the editor of *Graduate Comment* proposed that this issue be devoted to Monteith College and to the progress of the experiment in general education being carried out there, the staff of the College fell in with the idea at once. We of Monteith are acutely conscious of the fact that, of the many problems which engage our attention and make our days full, the problem of communication with the rest of the University community is perhaps the one with which we have dealt least adequately.

To be sure, hardly a day passes in which one or another of us is not engaged in responding to a request for information about the Monteith program. Interest in this venture of Wayne's is deep and widespread - nor is it confined to the boundaries of the United States. No week is complete without its letter of inquiry: from a journalist who wishes to include an account of Monteith in the story he is writing on education in travail in the United States, from a faculty committee somewhere which has been charged with the task of revitalizing undergraduate education at its college, or from a dean whose college has just embarked upon a novel reconstruction of its curricular pattern and who wishes to compare notes. Each visitor to Wayne's campus, who comes to appraise at first hand the vitality and excitement for which Wayne is rapidly becoming widely known, apparently counts his visit incomplete if it does not include a searching (and frequently lengthy) discussion of the origin and nature of the Monteith experiment. Locally, members of the Monteith staff have used the written and the spoken word through virtually all the media of communication to expound the Monteith story for the benefit of high school students, their parents and counsellors, lay and professional groups and individuals, upon occasions either presented to them or contrived by them. And the tale is being told also across the seas, as Woodburn Ross, Director of Monteith, employs his sabbatical year not only to deepen his understanding of Western culture through explorations of European museums and cathedrals but also to make extensive inquiries into the present state of European higher education and into the ferment which is at work in the colleges and universities of Western Europe, evoked by the rapid social changes which have taken place since the war. In the course of these inquiries Ross has given, as well as received, information, so that knowledge of the Monteith experiment exists in many places; and one of the most astonishing aspects of this exchange of views is its revelation of the extent to which our colleagues abroad, in their analysis of and prescription for the educational needs of European youth, have paralleled the course of thought which led to the creation of Monteith and of analogous experiments in the United States.

We have entitled this account "A Conversation on Monteith College." Indeed, the third part of this issue is based upon an actual conversation conducted recently by five members of the Monteith staff: Sally Cassidy, Max Coral, George Drury, Richard Pope, and Alfred Stern. I say "based" because we have taken some pardonable liberties with the actual recorded conversation, smoothing out the crudities of oral expression and shamelessly improving it on occasion by incorporating our better second thoughts. The conversation "takes off" from a paper which we asked Pope to write, and this paper forms the second part of this issue. If a consensus emerges from the conversation, it is to be regarded as a consensus of the five and not necessarily an official position of the staff of Monteith College. Quite possibly five other members of the staff might have arrived at different conclusions. But the conversation will underline the kinds of concerns that animate the thinking of those who have joined the Monteith staff as they seek definition and redefinition of the enterprise with which they have associated themselves.

The conversation, then, is the most significant part of our present attempt at explaining Monteith. But there is room for simple fact, history, and description also and these I shall try to supply in this first essay.

History

Legalistically speaking, Monteith College counts its date of origin as December 22, 1958, when President Hilberry announced the creation of the College to the University under authority which had previously been granted by the Board of Governors. But if history, for Monteith, begins with this date there is quite naturally a period of prehistory which begins in the summer of 1957. In that summer Woodburn O. Ross (English) had undertaken to write a report, at the behest of Vice President Lloyd Cook, upon the relations at Wayne between liberal and professional education. Interest in this subject among Wayne faculty had been underlined by the high priority accorded it in a list of many topics which had been suggested as appropriate to the University self-study which seemed desirable in the light of the University's change to state control. The matter was also the focus of a study then being made under the direction of Earl J. McGrath of the Institute of Higher Education at Columbia under a grant from the Carnegie Corporation.

The report which Ross submitted to Vice President Cook led the latter to propose that Ross assemble a committee to explore the possibility of designing a program of general education for pre-profession students which might receive favorable attention from Wayne's professional schools. Such a committee was created by the adjunction to Ross of Alfred H. Kelly (History) and Max Coral (Mathematics). It bore the title of the Committee on General Education but was popularly known in campus discussions as the Ross Committee. Work was begun in the fall of 1957 at a somewhat leisurely pace, made more leisurely by an illness which put Ross *hors de combat* for a time; but an event occurred in December of 1957 which galvanized the committee into sudden action. President Hilberry returned from a visit with Clarence Faust, Vice President of the Ford Foundation, convinced that if the University could devise an imaginative new venture in general education for undergraduates it could find the support to help it bear the impact of the new costs occasioned by the initiation of such a program. Under the President's direction the Ross Committee prepared a request to the Fund for the Advancement of Education for money to be used in designing a plan for a new college on Wayne's campus, to be devoted to a program of general education. In April, 1958, the Fund granted the University the sum of $25,000 to help defray the cost of such planning.

A new era now began for the Ross Committee. In early June Alfred Kelly found it necessary to withdraw from the committee because of other commitments he had assumed for the summer, and Vera Dunham (Slavic Languages) took his place upon the committee. Working under forced draft the committee made rapid decisions among alternatives which it had hitherto allowed to remain free. Choices were made as to the size and scope of the experiment and fiscal aspects of the plan were analyzed so that budgets might be constructed. By mid-August the task of design had been completed and the pro-

posal had been committed to writing in the gray document previously mentioned, wherein the committee presented not only an extended description of the intended experiment but also an account of the underlying rationale.

One of the purposes for which the Foundation's planning grant had been given was to make possible a University conference to discuss the committee's proposal. In a moment of exuberance the committee chose to hold the conference shortly after Labor Day, 1958, at the Grand Hotel on Mackinac Island, at after-season rates! Here, for four days, some fifty colleagues assembled to explore, discuss, and debate the proposed experiment in general education and to listen to a panel of consultants: Knox Hill, Examiner of the College at the University of Chicago and editor of the Journal of General Education; Malcolm Preston, Co-director of the Self-Study Project at the University of Pennsylvania; Dean John Burchardt of the Division of Social Studies and Humanities at Massachusetts Institute of Technology; and Chester Lawson, Chairman of the Natural Science Course in the Basic College at Michigan State University. It is not possible to describe the proceedings of this conference within the confines of this essay or to attempt to reduce to a paragraph or two the spate of words we were all able to unloose in eight sessions of the conference over some twenty hours. The proceedings were recorded on tapes which are still available to any who wish to listen to them, as a number of our colleagues have indeed done.

When the conference had concluded its business and the conferees had returned to campus, the proposal of the committee was submitted to the several legislative councils of the University for consideration. At a special meeting of the University Council in September, 1958, the proposal was approved in principal and the Council of Deans took similar action shortly thereafter. The matter passed then to the Board of Governors, who on October 22, 1958, adopted the following resolution:

> "Resolved that the Board of Governors endorses in principle the proposal for an experimental college in general education, and enthusiastically supports the application for a grant to make the creation of this project possible; it further authorizes the President to establish such a college upon being assured of the grant of the necessary funds."

On December 12, 1958, the Ford Foundation announced to the University that it had made a grant of $700,000 to help the University bear the impact of the new costs inherent in establishing for a five-year period a college in which the contemplated program of general education might be incorporated. Public announcement of the grant was delayed until December 22, by a New York newspaper strike. The money was given to the University in a lump sum, to be disbursed as needed. Since new costs are heaviest in the earlier years, it can be expected that the budget for Monteith College will be largely financed in the first years from the Foundation grant, with only slight contributions from University resources, and that this proportion will be reversed in the later years of the experiment. It should be clear then that the University's expenditures upon Monteith students from its own resources will be no greater than those it would have incurred in educating these same students had the University not been so fortunate as to receive a grant from the Ford Foundation for the purpose of establishing Monteith College.

The Monteith Program

From the curricular point of view, the essence of the Monteith plan consists in the creation of a core of courses which should serve the needs of general education and which should become the central concern of a faculty largely devoted to the ends of general education. No part of the individual's education, of course, is confined to or will end with his formal schooling; and that part which we are here calling general education and which is not concerned with the acquisition of knowledge in a specialty or as training for a profession is no exception. Such considerations shaped the decision not to confine the Monteith courses in general education to the first two undergraduate years but rather to extend them through the entire four years in more than symbolic recognition of the principle that general education is a continuing concern of the individual.

The core courses in the Monteith program further represent the embodiment of a second pedagogical choice in that they deliberately eschew the strictly cellular organization of the presentation of knowledge by means of the conventional academic disciplines. This choice is not to be interpreted as stemming from any hostility to the disciplinary organization of knowledge, whose value for the rapid advance of man's deep insights into his world is soundly based on the unassailable principle of "divide and conquer." Rather, the choice is based upon the fundamental need of general, as contrasted with specialized, education to emphasize the relations which unite, rather than the aspects which separate, our various views of the world. The disciplines as such enter into the structure of the Monteith courses when their contributions, as not infrequently happens, clearly serve this primary end of broadening the understanding by the paradoxical technique of narrowing the view.

It may therefore seem highly illogical that the Monteith basic courses have been organized so as to cover three large areas: the natural sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities. The illogic arises from the arbitrariness of the division, and the danger of neglecting common elements and overlappings. Yet some structure seems to be needed as an organizing principle for differentiating functions in such a college as Monteith and therefore, for better or for worse, the College is organized into three divisions: the Division of Natural Science, the Division of the Science of Society, and the Division of Humanistic Studies. Each division has its own staff whose responsibility is the conduct of the corresponding basic course in the Monteith program. I wish to express the purely personal view, which may however be shared by many of the Monteith staff, that a major problem, whose solution will demand our utmost skill, is to maximize the extent to which these three staffs act as one in achieving articulation among the three basic Monteith courses.

I now turn to a more pedestrian account of the Monteith core curriculum. The student who enters the Monteith program enrolls as a first-semester freshman in the natural science course, which runs for a sequence of four semesters and will engage his attention till the end of the sophomore year. At the same time he registers for the three-semester sequence of the social science course. When the latter ends in the middle of the sophomore year, the student embarks upon the three-semester humanities sequence, which terminates at the end of the junior year. The College then provides a capstone course for the senior year in the form of its senior colloquia, one in each of the divisions and of which the student elects two in each senior semester.

Each basic course other than the colloquia meets four times a week. Twice a week on the average, all students registered in a basic course assemble to attend a lecture, whose purpose may be to provide an exposition that will carry the students over some given terrain, or to illuminate and interrelate the students' readings, or to provide the opportunity to hear a guest lecturer with a special contribution to make to the progress of the course. In addition the students meet twice a week in small discussion groups, limited at the outset of the program to twelve students in a group. The program places heavy reliance for its educational outcomes upon what takes place in the discussion groups, but since this matter is discussed in Richard Pope's paper and in the ensuing conversation, I shall not touch upon it here.

A little reflection should make it clear that the student who embarks upon the Monteith program will devote to it half

of his curricular energy in the freshman and sophomore years and one quarter in the junior and senior years. His remaining time will be given to courses taken in preparation for a profession or specialty if that is his goal; otherwise he will, with advice, pursue a course of study whose principal goal is a liberal education.

Not all the curricular features of the Monteith program are made evident by the above description. In the first place, there is the matter of the improvement of student writing. This becomes a responsibility of all members of the Monteith staff throughout the four years of the student's participation in the program, so that each of the numerous papers written by a student will receive attention as an example of communication. In coping with this responsibility of theirs, the staff will receive technical assistance from Woodburn Ross, but during this year of Ross' absence Dayle Wallace of the Department of English is acting as a most effective substitute.

In the second place, a heavy emphasis is placed upon the cultivation of intellectual self-sufficiency in the student. While provision is made for a presumed immaturity in the student on his entrance into the program as a freshman--and this is one justification for the initial smallness of the discussion groups--by various devices among which the discussion groups themselves and the senior colloquia are important, it is hoped that students will acquire that capacity for continued self-education which all agree should be the mark of the college graduate.

The Monteith Students

Monteith is not an "honors college." It is not a program for an elite student body. The planners of the program and the staff that has assembled around them are convinced on the one hand that greater demands can be made of American college youth than are habitually made, but on the other hand are committed to demonstrating that this is feasible with the students whom Wayne accepts under its present standards of admission. Hence students are selected for the Monteith program by a "random invitational process," to use the awkward name which I have invented for the technique. There are at present five professional schools which have agreed to participate in the Monteith program; Business Administration, Education, Engineering, Law and Medicine. A student who applies for admission to Wayne with the intention of pursuing a curriculum in one of these professional schools makes this fact known upon his application for admission. The Office of Admissions sends to every third or fourth such student whose admissibility has been established an invitation to participate in the Monteith program, and Monteith accepts all who respond favorably to this invitation until the curriculum "quota" of approximately fifty students has been reached. The College also accepts, however, students who initiate the move themselves, up to its capacity to take them. This capacity is defined so as to enable the College to accept a total of 480 students annually from which it will result that the enrollment of students in Monteith courses will achieve an equilibrium at between one thousand and eleven hundred students.

In September, 1959, the College admitted its first class. Three hundred and forty were accepted, of whom 314 actually registered - a rate of slippage somewhat smaller than that generally experienced at Wayne. By the end of the fall semester the College had lost its expected number through withdrawal from college or transfer to another institution; here too the rate of attrition was only slightly less than that in Wayne's general experience. The scholastic performance of those who remained was higher than that for freshman generally, but it remains to be seen whether the difference is significant.

Monteith College is pledged to carry on a continuous program of evaluation in order to provide the materials on which the University community may form its judgments as to the successes and failures of the experiment. With respect to cognitive and intellectual matters such things as grades and honor point averages, both in Monteith and non-Monteith courses, will of course be available; the difficulty here will undoubtedly lie in attempting to ascribe to the student's Monteith experiences such differences as these criteria may reveal. Other kinds of possible outcomes of the Monteith experiment are more intangible and may be far more difficult to discern or describe. We are already embarked on such an attempt in our evaluations program, under the direction of Carol Kaye. Each Monteith student has had a lengthy interview and taken a day-long battery of tests, including for example the Omnibus Personality Inventory which explores such matters as the student's social maturity and developmental status. Since this latter test, developed by the Center for Higher Education at the University of California under a grant from the Carnegie Corporation, is also being taken by students at such colleges as Antioch, Harvard, Reed, Vassar, and San Francisco State, the possibility will exist of making comparisons on a national scale. Nor is the evaluation process limited to the students of Monteith. A study of the Monteith faculty is also being made under a project being currently conducted by David Riesman of Harvard and Joseph Gusfield of Illinois.

Further studies are contemplated of these same students as they progress through Monteith College. Some analysis of the data now at hand is already under way, but it is quite clear that Monteith will need greater resources than it has available for this task. We have hopes of obtaining support from outside the University that will permit Miss Kaye to do an adequate job in this important domain.

The Monteith Staff

When President Hilberry announced the creation of the College he designated also the administrative structure that was to govern it. Woodburn Ross was named Director of the College and Max Coral was asked to serve as Acting Director during Ross' absence on sabbatical leave tor the year 1959-1960. Governance of the College was lodged in the hands of the Director and of the Administrative Council of the College, composed of the chairmen of the three College Divisions. Director Ross was to double in brass as chairman of the Division of Humanistic Studies and Max Coral would serve as chairman of the Division of Natural Science. To fill the post of chairman of the Division of the Science of Society, the College was extremely fortunate to enlist the services of Miss Sally W. Cassidy, who had been serving as chairman of one of the social science courses in the College at the University of Chicago.

An enumeration of the staff that has been assembled may resemble Homer's catalogue of ships, but it will help to introduce the Monteith staff, by name at least, to a wider audience than has yet had the opportunity of meeting them. We may begin with the Humanities staff, which will number four or five. Of these Ross has already appointed two: Glenn Gould (Music) and Sarah Leopold (English). In the Natural Science Division, the present members of the staff are Barbara Gimbel (Philosophy), Urless Lanham (Zoology), Clifford Maier (History of Science), Jordan Sobel (Philosophy), and Alfred Stern (Philosophy of Science); Joseph T. Armstrong (Ecology) and Jerry Bails (Mathematics and Physics), will join the staff this summer.

(Concluded on Page Twelve)

GRADUATE COMMENT

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
Detroit 2, Michigan

Volume III June, 1960

Published by the Graduate Division of Instruction and Research, Wayne State University, Office of Assistant Vice President.

William M. Birenbaum.....Editor
Jean I. Widger...Assistant to the Editor

Graduate Comment is issued during the first week of October, December, February, April and June of each year.

EDUCATION AS A STYLE OF CONVERSATION

by RICHARD K. POPE

Monteith College is a part of Wayne State University but it has a faculty which has been recruited within the past year almost entirely from other universities. As one of these new initiates to the Wayne scene, I am often asked, "Why did you come?" and "How do you like it here?" As a preface to the discussion which is to follow, I shall attempt to answer both of these questions.

I will try to answer the first question, "Why did you come here?" in two ways: 1) in terms of ideas and 2) in terms of experience. In terms of ideas, the main reason is that there just are not many chances in one's lifetime to get in on the ground floor of a new college, to say nothing of a new experimental college. In terms of experience, I felt that I had been involved in both good and bad educational programs which led me to formulate some ideas about what made the good ones *good*, and the bad ones *bad*. I did my own undergraduate work at Reed College in Portland, Oregon, and followed it with graduate work in anthropology at the University of Chicago. Later, I was an instructor in the social sciences at the College of the University of Chicago. These institutions are the good ones but they are not all alike.

The program of the College of the University of Chicago was carefully planned so as to expose the student to a series of "great ideas." Ideally, according to the Chicago plan, a student was to be exposed to *all* of the "great ideas" and if as a result of his college education he became "more rational," if he became a "thinking person," it did not matter very much what happened to him after he left college; in fact, the College was not very much interested in where he went after he left the College and provided the student with no specific training in any field. It was assumed that whatever field or career he chose, he would have the best intellectual equipment with which to ask the right questions. One rarely talked of specific academic disciplines at the College of the University of Chicago. The great ideas were "just there" in the common pool of experience of Western man, ready to be plucked out when needed to be applied to new situations.

At Reed College on the other hand, while the program leaned strongly in the interdisciplinary direction, the disciplines themselves were rarely lost sight of. Finally, the graduate program of the Department of Anthropology at the University of Chicago was, of course, oriented specifically to only one discipline.

What these three educational programs had in common was that a fairly high proportion of students in all three institutions turned out to be what are commonly called "intellectuals." What do I mean by "intellectuals"? I mean someone who can take any event or circumstance in whatever area of life that it occurs and immediately put this new event or circumstance in one or more new contexts simply by being able to see a set of relations between the new event and other events with which the person is already familiar. In other words, instead of seeing the world in terms of isolated fragments, the intellectual has some sort of framework by means of which he is able to organize these fragments into meaningful wholes. I would further qualify this by saying that the more intellectual a person is, the less likely is any event (be it physical, biological, artistic or trivial) to be foreign to him and his various frameworks. Secondly, the more intellectual a person is, the more likely he is to modify his framework on the basis of new experience. I do not identify being intellectual with being intelligent, because 1) I do not know what intelligence is and 2) I know some people who are considered to be very brilliant whom I would not regard as very intellectual as well as some not so brilliant people who do seem to be intellectuals.

Let me now discuss my experience with what I tend to regard as a bad educational program. For one year I was part of the faculty of the Anthropology Department of a very large and very reputable state university. (The university's reputation was based upon the eminence of its faculty and the integrity of its graduate program. With neither of these do I have any quarrel. I will discuss the undergraduate program.) The undergraduate educational program of this university was very simple. As an old saying goes, "Information was transmitted from the notebook of the professor to the notebook of the student, and through the minds of neither." For the undergraduates, the university performed a very important function: after they had taken a certain number of credit hours, they were given a degree which was of practical usefulness to them in later life. For the faculty of any particular department in this university, the undergraduates also had an important function: the more of them who drifted into the courses of any particular department, the more faculty which would be needed to teach them, and the more faculty a department had the more likely it was to have a good program of graduate studies. Thus, the undergraduates, in effect, subsidized graduate programs with high faculty-student ratios. Each member of the faculty who taught an undergraduate course also contributed specialized knowledge to strengthen the graduate program.

The main difference that I see between the three good educational programs that I have mentioned and the one bad one is that the first three schools were also *intellectual communities* while the fourth school was not.

What makes an intellectual community? First, one needs some intellectuals. These intellectuals need not all have Ph.D.'s nor foreign cars, nor need they decorate their homes with Japanese mats and cinder block bookcases; but they should have incorporated some of the standards of some larger intellectual community beyond their own university, profession and their own prejudices. Secondly, if you have too many people in any community, it will cease being a community and become instead a bureaucracy, which is a very different sort of thing. Finally, an intellectual community must have a certain *style of conversation* which its members take more or less for granted. Thus, various discussions, whether they take place in a bar, backyard, coffee house, classroom, or on a fishing trip, will tend to reinforce each other whereas if the styles of conversation for these diverse situations are not related, they will not. Styles of conversation vary, of course, as individuals vary. In some intellectual communities, there are common slogans, such as "state your assumptions" which may enable new members to learn the conversation-ethic more quickly. But the end result, I think, of the style of conversation that I have in mind, is that it becomes possible to "try on" different arguments or positions for "fit." You must be able to test your own radicalism against the arguments of a conservative until he convinces you and then test your new conservatism against your radical friends until you are convinced back again. As the philosopher, George

Herbert Mead would be likely to put it: You cannot know what all of the game of baseball is about until you can at least conceive of playing all the positions on the team. You must be flexible by being able to incorporate a set of standards by means of which one individual can convince another.

I hope I have answered my first question of why I came here. I saw Monteith College as an opportunity to bring together a group of intellectuals with a small group of students, and among them they would be able to initiate a peculiar style of discussion, unique in its own way of course, but similar in spirit to that developed at other institutions whose names are synonymous with American educational success. Yet how would such an intellectual community, if it could be formed here on the undergraduate level, harmonize with the Wayne atmosphere in general? Would the ideal Monteith (as I have outlined it) constitute an elite, aristocratic, tumorous growth on the body of a very democratically inclined University which has long emphasized specialized training of one sort or another as an integral part of its program? I hope that it is clear from my foregoing remarks that I would not want to be a part of Monteith College if that is the way the issue were drawn. Such a statement of the problem belongs I believe to the rhetoric of educators in the 1930's: "the cultural heritage of Western man" versus "education for living" which was essentially an issue about curricula. I have tried to make clear that the issue of curriculum is not what I am talking about, that it is less important what is taught than how it is taught. In order to be an intellectual one must live in a world of ideas, but one must also live in a world with other people who have ideas and if the other people know their Cicero, then you had better know your Cicero, too, if you wish to be an intellectual. However, we presently live in a world of many merging cultural streams: it is becoming harder to assert the superiority of St. Thomas Aquinas over the Upanishads, and the one band wagon that the whole world is climbing on is modern science. The content of the curriculum becomes important I believe, if education be regarded as being confined to the school; whereas if the school be thought of as that place where a person is introduced to the world of the intellectual, then "the pressure is off" as regards more specific goals of general education.

The whole American educational system is now the subject of much criticism and re-evaluation. Part of the criticism has taken the form of looking across the water, or perhaps across the steppes, for models which we might emulate locally. We do not need to look so far for emulation. Much of American graduate and professional education is excellent and unmatched anywhere in the world. On the undergraduate level, small colleges such as my own ***alma mater***, Reed College, have produced very high proportions of creative scientists and scholars in many fields relative to their small student body size. There is the rub. All of these superior educational endeavors have been characterized by the advantages of smallness. Heaven knows that being small is not a sufficient condition for the success of an educational program; in fact, if one searches for the worst institutions of higher education in the country, they would probably turn out to be some of the small colleges. But I would seriously claim that smallness is a necessary condition. To go to what I believe is the heart of the matter, our educational system has had its greatest weakness in the primary, secondary and undergraduate levels of education because, being dedicated to the idea that everyone should be educated, we have been faced with the necessity of giving degrees (note: not educations) to astronomical numbers of students and in order to do this as efficiently as possible, we have made our educational institutions into large corporate enterprises, devoted to achieving the same norms of efficiency as are aimed at by industrial concerns. (It is interesting to note that in the vast amount of educational building going on all over the country, it is increasingly difficult to tell a modern suburban school from a modern suburban factory, and I believe that this is no accident. Wayne is a pleasant exception to this trend. But as we have been dedicated to giving people degrees regardless of income, might it also not be possible to give people educations regardless of income? This is the crux of why I came to Monteith College at Wayne State University. Is it possible for students at a large democratic public university to belong to the same kind of intellectual community as is presently enjoyed by those students whose families have the means to send them to one of the few excellent private colleges in the country?

I shall be briefer in answering the second question: "How do you like it here?" It is much too early to have any fixed judgments. I can only give a few impressions. My strongest impression is that too many people both within Monteith and without have conceived of the purposes of the college along two well-worn grooves of thought, that the college is primarily an attempt at curricular revision and integration, or alternately, that the program is for particularly precocious students who might be slowed in their intellectual advancement if they took a more normal course. Both of these suggestions are in line with certain sharply accentuated trends in American higher education and were they to be realized, it is my opinion that the effect of Monteith College upon Wayne University as a whole would be minimal and the effect upon higher education in general, nil.

Another impression I have of Wayne (and please forgive a newcomer if this is too hastily formulated an impression) is that it is in the process of being up-graded as a university, that this process of up-grading means that its graduate program over the next decade will be greatly strengthened, that it is in the process of becoming—now that it is a state supported university—more like any other state university and that by 1970 it will have lost much of its present unique legacy as a former part of the Detroit public school system. I don't know whether this will be good or bad, but I think it will be inevitable and that the net gain for the *undergraduate* student will be very little. In fact, as the number of students enrolled in the University increases, these same undergraduate students may have less and less of an opportunity of being part of an intellectual community made up of faculty and other students.

What I am trying to say is that it does not make much difference what educational philosophy you happen to have. There have been successful "progressive" colleges such as Antioch or Bennington; there have been successful "conservative" colleges such as St. John's or Chicago. But if you are forced to treat students like cattle who punch credit hours as they would time-clocks, you are bound to fail. Furthermore, the days of the small private college are over. Not only are they finding it increasingly difficult to support themselves, but even if they manage that they will be educating proportionately a smaller percentage of the American college population.

The challenge then, is whether we can build the success of the private college or of the good graduate department or professional school, into the very fabric of our system of mass training of undergraduates. Thus, if Monteith is a success in these terms, it will not simply be a bump on the back of Wayne, but it will set a pattern which can be copied by other universities as well as other colleges at Wayne. Monteith is presently the only college on the campus to have its own student center apart from the main student center, but why could not the College of Education or the College of Engineering, also have their own student centers, and their own distinctive styles of conversation? Might they, too, not reap some of the advantages of smallness in developing their own capacities as intellectual communities made up of students and faculty? Here again I suggest that it is important to rid oneself of the notion that Monteith College represents primarily

(Concluded on Page Nineteen)

DISCUSSION: EDUCATION AS A STYLE OF CONVERSATION

by MAX CORAL, RICHARD K. POPE,

SALLY WHELAN CASSIDY, GEORGE DRURY and ALFRED STERN

George Drury: There are a couple of things I think ought to be said about Mr. Pope's paper. One is that its nostalgia, its concern with the past, ought to be mentioned. I gather whether right or wrong, the impression of a hankering after what was once for him an academic good time and the desire to see it return. This would be all to the good if we could manage it. But is it ever possible to turn back the clock? We are here and not another place, and our opportunities and problems are present or not at all. Secondly, while conversation and style of conversation as a characterization of education is part of the story, I don't think it is a sufficiently adequate characterization of the Monteith story. Mr. Pope would have us, I think, pay somewhat less attention to matters of curriculum, even less to the arranged-for discussion in the classroom, and least attention to such things as interaction with and between disciplines (by this I mean the kind of conversation or discussion that takes place among us as members of a faculty). Further, and this would be a third point, perhaps a "style of conversation" is rather better conceived as a goal, a peculiar kind of "goal," (since it would be disastrous to pursue it directly), rather than as a means of education. In the course of our discussion I would like to hear what Mr. Pope and my other colleagues assembled here have to say upon these points. For in sum, it seems to me the Pope paper addresses itself to a backward look rather than to a look at the present. This in turn leads it to neglect certain, and for purposes of argument, even more important aspects of the Monteith story than informal faculty-student conversation. Finally, as a characterization of education "style of conversation" is a better expression for a goal we might hope to see achieved rather than for an instrument of education itself.

Alfred Stern: While I certainly have strong empathetic responses to the emphasis on the establishment of a common set of assumptions with its implicit emphasis upon the development of an intellectual community (a community, that is to say, a nexus characterized by some specific set of concordances), still it seems more important to look at the strands of history which lie in the background and then it seems clear that Monteith is occurring at a critical juncture. Many schools, as has been pointed out in the examples given, have achieved this style, this unity, and while it surely would be no mean accomplishment to do only this, I think in part we are trying to do something else. Let me explain what I think the something else is.

Since the second World War we have an accelerated movement in the educational scene toward increasing vocational training. This training may be in the lesser realms of sheer mechanics or skills or in the honorific realms of medicine, law, and graduate studies; all of these I look upon as vocational training. As such training becomes necessary in any of the specialized areas, somehow the other traditional goal of education, the passing on to the next generation of the best that has been thought and done, is increasingly diminished (that's perfect—"increasingly diminished"). So we have a larger share of the educational time being spent in preparing one for one's job. On the other hand, another tendency is that less and less time is spent on the job and the amount of leisure time is continuously being increased. Here we have two important movements in our society. It seems to me that leisure time cannot be spent properly without training. So, in a sense, we should be educating our students to be consumers of intellectual and cultural goods, and our colleges should be so organized as to achieve this end. To summarize: In recognition of the twin problems just mentioned we should pass on to the student the richest and most enduring part of our traditions and an understanding of whence they came so that he may be fully able to participate in the culture as a more complete human being for the rest of his life.

Max Coral: I'd like to take a look at the three good schools and the one bad one with which Mr. Pope had experience. The common element in the three good ones, he says, is that they formed intellectual communities. He defines intellectual community quite admirably. First of all it involves intellectuals; second, it's not very large; and, third, it has an appropriate style of conversation. All three of these things I think are among our aims at Monteith. We have a staff—it may be that we can agree that they're intellectuals—and we aim at turning our students into intellectuals so they are at least neophyte intellectuals. Secondly, it is an important part of our purpose that this college remain small. We see bigness as perhaps one of the important rocks upon which we might flounder. And, third, there is a style of conversation which we try to cultivate as well as we can by the way we organize our courses and in particular by the spirit we want to prevail in our discussion groups. Perhaps our positions differ from Mr. Pope's only because he made his point with exaggerated emphasis. This leads him to accord relative insignificance to the curriculum. It is all very well to say we shall have a style of conversation, but conversation is about something. And in a college the conversation is about the curriculum, it seems to me. I can hardly envision a responsible scheme of college education such as Monteith hopes to provide which doesn't come to grips with the actual content of what this conversation shall be about. And this is what we mean when we stress the importance of curriculum. I grant that curriculum is not all important. Obviously the curriculum that is good on paper with a bad faculty is a poor education. We could perhaps, persuade Mr. Pope to agree with us that, while he didn't mean to consign curriculum to the nether regions, he meant that concern with curriculum alone is not what makes the college education good.

Sally Cassidy: What I like about Mr. Pope's notion is this emphasis upon intellectual community and I would like to develop other aspects of things we must do in order to support and give distinction to this intellectual community. I also heartily agree with his notion of the intellectual bringing essentially a framework to disparate experiences and being able to respond in a fairly organized way to what he sees, what he experiences. I think part of our conversation with the students certainly is to communicate some such framework, to help them organize their own.

The thing that interests me, and has for a long time, is this notion of coherence. Let us say we are interested in an intellectual community. There are various aspects of it which are perhaps more hidden than curriculum, things such as the quality of the staff, the type of examination, whether there are tutorials or not, the kinds of papers that are written, the kinds of advising systems, whether or not students have research experience or contact with the outside type of work experiences. Perhaps Antioch College might be an example. In other words, a lot of factors, which may perhaps be subsidiary, must be made coherent in an intellectual enterprise. If we have an advising system which is not geared into the intellectual life but into the vocational aspect, we are in serious trouble. If our examination is not concerned with some sort of intellectual framework we will be in trouble. If we do not allow the student to test his various ideas or if we do not try to organize experiences for him so that he can gradually incorporate newer and broader experiences into this slowly developing framework, we will be doing only half the job.

Richard Pope: My paper was addressed to the question of whether or not what we are doing at Monteith College really represents a new approach to the problems presented by mass higher education. Looking at any part of our program individually, such as our extensive use of the discussion method of teaching on the undergraduate level, we might be able to say that while what we have to offer is new to Wayne, it is not new to higher education in general. It is rather the total impact of Monteith existing within the context of a large state university which is what is new to education. From this point of view, I think it fortunate that we are not tied down specifically to one kind of curriculum. If we succeed, for example, it ought not be too difficult for other colleges with other curriculum interests to follow our example.

The difference between a good undergraduate school (in the sense of one that is an intellectual community) and a bad one is very much like the difference between a good law school and a bad one. Thus, I would disagree with Mr. Stern on the question of whether historical traditions of thought are the most important things to be emphasized here. The social science course in the Monteith curriculum has already departed from this emphasis and I think that if you get intellectuals on the various staffs they will develop a curriculum which will emphasize subject matter areas which are important to some larger community of scholars. Whether or not this is the community of their peers in various particular disciplines is not the most crucial question for me. The intellectual integrity and excellence of the various people on the staff seems to me to be the most important factor here. Questions of introducing the student to " the main streams of Western thought" or of equal representation for each of the various disciplines in an undergraduate program seem less important. If the staff are good, they will create a curriculum which can serve as the basis for a "conversation." Certainly this was the case at the College of the University of Chicago. Other intellectual communities, however, have had other bases of conversation. For instance, although it is rather out of style at the moment, political involvement on a campus can be the basis for a conversation. Also, a common experience in the arts or a set of research ideas could be the basis for a conversation. Even a common examination, such as the Ph.D. examination in a graduate department can be a basis for conversation. On the other hand, I don't think that all of the problems of a new experimental college can be capsulated into the catch phrase, "a style of conversation." Certainly, not all of the problems that we have with examinations, advising, tutorials, papers, and contacts with parents, employers or with the rest of the university, are exhausted by the kinds of questions I was bringing up in the paper. What I did mean to suggest was that the notion of "conversation" would be used as a kind of guiding principle with respect to some of these things, that the discussion section by setting the style for *all* campus discussions, becomes the whole focus of the teaching program, as opposed to the lectures, the papers, or the examinations. The problem is not simply to create conversations between faculty and students. For the latter type of conversation to reach its full fruition, I think it is equally important for an atmosphere to prevail in the whole college whereby the faculty are also talking to other faculty and the students are talking to other students.

Drury: I'm not sure that what Mr. Pope has had to say brings up-to-date what he had to say in the paper. For a recognition of what time it actually is we need something more. My chief reaction to "conversation" as a term was that it seemed to suggest people talking to themselves. I think that with the possibilities of communication and extermination we all face, no group, educational, social, political, or what you will, is up-to-date unless it is talking to at least the problem of addressing itself to all groups, to what might be called the universal audience. This leads me to another point.

We have mentioned historical traditions of thought as possible subject matter for our curriculum. This is what goes under other names such as "the common fund of ideas that any educated man should possess," what in terms introduced by Mr. Pope's paper looks like a roster of "great ideas." When we talk about general education and projects such as Monteith, I think what usually happens is that we speak in the early stages of planning of a synthesis which looks all the more attractive because distance lends enhancement. The closer we come to this position, however, the more difficult and impossible of achievement the whole thing seems.

Thus far we have been less than just to the curriculum, because it will be noted that the curriculum in the two sections already developed, natural science and social science, is precisely not a curriculum which embodies a common content which the student learns. It is anything but that. In the natural science curriculum the student is not given the latest agreed-upon account of what constitutes science here and now. He is rather led through various periods of history, through considerations of what science has been or, we might say, of what has been science in times past. In the social science curriculum there is no fixed address to a single discipline, to some kind of synthetic amalgam offered under the name of social science. Rather there is a consciously introduced variety of approaches to the moving and fluid subject matter of the social sciences. In addition to the variety of disciplines introduced there is also an important and thus far insufficiently mentioned or emphasized introduction of a variety of "experiences." Addressing myself once more to Mr. Pope: It is these things which seem to me at least equally important in the Monteith story as the notion of education as a style of—and I will amend your statement—informal conversation.

Stern: I've listened with interest to Mr. Pope's amplification of his remarks and I was particularly fascinated by the variety of subject matters or experiences which he felt might form the basis for conversation. Surely, I would agree that one can converse fruitfully about many things but there is still some basis in saying that some conversations have continued for many generations, and for saying that some of these were better than others, which is to say that not all of them are equally good. Moreover, I believe that the richness of a conversation relies on the richness of its base. This brings me to the point that Mr. Drury just made; the variety and shifting point of view which he stresses is itself a product of the history of our disciplines and the discoveries that have been made by them. In a sense this certainly is part of the reason for the existing curriculum of Monteith. That curriculum is what it is because we are trying to understand what we are, in the broad sense, in-

cluding what we know—and we are what we are because we were what we were. I'm looking forward to some series of great ideas considered discretely. But the important intellectual advances which we prize as the positive results of scientific inquiry had historical antecedents and contexts and are themselves corrigible. Furthermore, I would not hold that everything is old and that nothing is new or that the new is less important than what is old.

Regardless of these qualifications of my remarks, I still maintain that there are some important subject matters and methods to be mastered and these are the basis for participating in the intellectual community and that there must be some base if there is to be some community. It is possible if one needs a label to call these the main streams of thought. The fact that we deal occasionally with the current play of the surface does not mean that the waters are not running deep or that their source is not somewhere in the past. Further, it needs to be stressed that we inescapably bear this past in our present. The full understanding of this I see as an important purpose of the courses we have.

Cassidy: Mr. Pope has a point in this business of style of conversation. Surely we are concerned about content. Nevertheless, conversation is not just a goal; it is also a means to this goal, in the sense that our students, we hope, will become gradually more astute at conversation, and the conversation he suggests has many levels or continuities. We wish that the students could handle themselves ably and skillfully in conversation, and this in itself implies recourse to a rather profound type of pedagogical principle. How do we communicate this sense of the other person's position, of the other, the requisites of the performance, the joint performance of the conversation? How do we get across the necessary distance, and yet involvement, so that this thing clicks, and is not simply something which occurs in a routine fashion, or in a very, very sloppy and desultory fashion? I am very much concerned with conversation as a means ultimately leading to the great conversation as an end.

Drury: Perhaps I haven't ever been opposed to what Mr. Pope really means by conversation, but there is a question about the honesty of the name. When you talk about this kind of performance it occurs to me that maybe the older writers of dialogues were a little bit franker in that they named the participants "master" and "disciple." I suppose my real fear—if it is a fear—of Mr. Pope's notion of education as a style of conversation is that it is too englobing, too inclusive. It suggests to me the etymological meaning of conversation as a living together. Now this may be rich and enriching, but I think we would give a better account of what we are doing if we had some better name for it besides "conversation." I don't think it is more than artificially a peer relationship between faculty and students. We are both human; we are both users of speech. But we don't want to fool the student. Certainly I've never been against student - student conversation, faculty-faculty conversation, or student-faculty dialogue.

Coral: I think you've put your finger on what I was trying to get at. Let me try again, though I'll probably descend to somewhat prosaic levels in trying. Let me tell you an anecdote from my recent experience. When we were discussing with Dr. Alvin Urich of the Ford Foundation the kind of experiment we had in mind in general education, we stressed (and I was perhaps the principle exponent of the stress) this point: that in the kind of general education we had in mind we could lay before the student the world as man had come to know it. In doing this we would not approach it conventionally by the microscopic points of view of the several specialists. The student doesn't see the world this way (and I speak of course not only of the world before him at present but of the world of the past). It is we, the academicians, who for good and sufficient reasons find it useful to examine the world from the point of view of the distinct disciplines. We said to Dr. Urich that it seemed to us that we should avoid doing this for the purposes of general education. It seemed to us that in an attempt to aid the students to come to an understanding of this world of theirs, we should deliberately depart from this attitude of circumscribed and partial vision. This prompted Dr. Urich to say to us, "Well, why then do you propose to found your program upon three divisions, the social sciences, the natural sciences, and the humanities? If the world is one great flux, why not treat it as such and have an undifferentiated staff? We recognized this query in its rhetorical character, yet we tried to meet it as honestly as we could. Of necessity, from the point of view of the appropriate organization of the college program, there had to be some division of labor but we strove for one that would not proceed quite so far as customarily the disciplines tend to do when they take out of any one of these three large areas some smaller segment and say this is that upon which they shall focus attention. One of the things I think we all hope for and which perhaps we will confess we haven't quite achieved in the Monteith experiment so far is this close interlocking, a close interacting among us all, whatever the division to which we belong, that will make each of our courses more deeply relevant to each other than they are now. Mr. Drury seems to doubt that we have done or are apt to succeed in doing much of this kind of thing. Yet I would say this must be a hope which we have, that somehow what we tell the student about the nature of the world around him as science has succeeded in learning is not to be separated completely from what man has come to learn of himself and his fellows as social creatures immersed in a culture. Surely neither of these is so completely to be separated from man the artist that the humanities can dare to neglect what either the sciences or the social sciences have had to say.

Stern: One of the points which you have just mentioned in passing recalled vividly a prime reason for my joining Monteith College. I was concerned lest my interest somehow tread on the toes of compartmentalized disciplines (and this may be the way they would look at it), and I recall your reassurance that within the Monteith program this difficulty would not arise. As you are aware, the attempt has been made in some of our tutorials to do just this; to break across not only the large areas into which we've divided the program but even to cross these divisions, so that we are treating, in one course, some material from the humanities, some from the social sciences, and some of the natural sciences. This without any qualms or the urge to consider this amalgam a new discipline.

Drury: What Mr. Stern has just said suggests a way of stating something that earlier I didn't know how to state. My seeming insistence on curriculum may ultimately come to the same thing as Mr. Pope means to suggest by "conversation." Nevertheless I am attracted by the notion that only distinct things can be united. I think we have provided at Monteith for at least the possibility of the cross-disciplinary conversation which both Mr. Stern and Mr. Coral have mentioned. We have provided for it by an emphasis on what I call the "disciplines of the disciplines." I have to expand that in order to have it make any sense. We have stressed in practice the intellectual disciplines such as logic, rhetoric, or dialectic, and have brought them to bear upon the disciplines which have subject matters. We have frequently stated to the students: "We study not only the various subject matters, for example, man's interaction with things, man's interaction with man, or man's interaction with language (one way talking about the natural sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities); we study also the studies which we are constantly concerned with." We ask constantly in reading the various things we read, "What is the author doing?" I know of no more useful question to attain this added dimension in which conversation can

occur than that question. This perhaps constitutes whatever possible contribution we have to make as a totality to a large university like Wayne, namely, that we are a center of reflection or mean to be one. Even as in our consideration of the subject matter of the natural sciences, the social sciences or eventually the humanities, we study not only subject matter but also study the studies, thus reflecting upon what is being done; so, also, we might hope to form students in habits of reflection so that they would address their other studies in the University with greater understanding and greater skill in handling themselves in pursuit of the subject matter of these studies.

Pope: One word here in dèfense of disciplines: the disciplines do constitute intellectual communities. I would be very happy if some of our Monteith graduates in the future were to feel themselves sufficiently attached to a discipline so as to want to subscribe to a scholarly journal of that particular discipline even though their own professional commitment might be elsewhere, say, to secondary school teaching. Also, I am a bit pessimistic about the integration of disciplines at Monteith. I gather from Mr. Stern's remarks that he feels boxed in by the disciplinary boundaries of the natural sciences and I am sympathetic with the lines of inquiry which he suggests that an adventurous spirit in the natural sciences might pursue.

However, there is a difference between being aware of problems in other disciplines than one's own and integrating disciplines. One integrates disciplines by making them into something else (for instance, by making them into philosophy); one often has to create one's own special vocabulary for doing this with the result that one can become separated from the intellectual communities which these disciplines represent. My own feeling as an anthropologist is that while I have certainly benefited from participation in an interdisciplinary social science course, I wouldn't say that this is my area of major interest.

What interests me the most about Monteith is that we are not just setting up a new curriculum but we are creating a new institution with its traditions yet to be formed, a new sub-society, if you will, in which certain social relations will be crucial, not only the student-faculty, student-student, and faculty-faculty relations, but also relations between students and the environments from which they come and the various kinds of occupational or other environmental settings which they will meet in the future. Also, one point not mentioned so far that I would like to hear discussed is the whole matter of our relations with the rest of the University, which is certainly a crucial relation. In my paper I tried to emphasize that I did not think we ought to be living entirely in our own intellectual domicile and I wonder how we can draw the rest of the University into our discussions or be drawn into the discussions of the rest of the University.

Cassidy: To talk to the point about juncture between the various branches or divisions of Monteith—it was striking that this morning at the lecture we had on function, there was a deliberate attempt to move from biology to society. We considered how the concept of function became more and more used in biology rather than some such idea as purpose, and the very way in which this particular notion was developed by the lecturer reminded me very much of how I had seen other notions of the structure of the universe developed in a natural science lecture. We had an instance where an analogy or a common type of experience is occuring in two different divisions, but went even further than that inasmuch as the lecturer also stressed the question, "Why did it take so long for a superior system to win people's consent?" Why is it that people will give assent to one particular way of explanation even though for the time being it does not seem to be richer or more effective, but simply because it seems to be more appropriate or to fit the present temper of the age, or more rigorous demands, or a shift in perspective about other parts of the universe. I think it was excellent that the students were able to see living in front of them a very definite juncture of social and natural sciences and I hope there will be more of this. Certainly going to each other's lectures, as we often do, helps. Our particular lecturer was able to make quite explicit references back and forth between natural and social sciences. I think we are moving towards a more intimate dialogue between the divisions.

I'd also like to talk to another point, which is integration. Surely one of our wealths is a very distinct bias in favor of plurality: not to give simply one pitch and say "this is it," but rather to give the notion to the students again and again that there are a variety of positions which could be taken, have been taken, are apparently being taken on various issues and various problems. This in itself leads toward the sort of distinction in conversation which we are dealing with.

Drury: Your last remarks, Miss Cassidy, seem somewhat less than just to what I would not want us to lose sight of, that is, what confronts us as a genuine part of the Monteith experiment. Our students are confronted by different kinds of analogies and they should be. Analogies are all right. However, what in principle may have made our fortune, so to speak, has been precisely that we have stayed away from amalgams and conglomerations, that we have emphasized *analogy* rather than analogies. In other words, our probing into the meaning of the generality of general education has invoked (perhaps not by way of explicit doctrine, perhaps not by way of explicit art or discipline as such, but nonetheless implicitly) the bridge, the path between. In the natural sciences we have used history for this. In the social sciences we have employed recognition of concrete diversity, the recognition that human life, human social behavior, human interaction is of such a nature that in the end it eludes the disciplinary grasp, the attempt to pin it down. In your account of the speaker's references to biology, social science, and perhaps politics or cultural or historical environment you have not brought out as much as you might why the speaker was able to do this.. It is because he has habituated himself to traveling over the tracks without putting things together in some kind of amalgam or monstrosity. But there is another interesting aspect of our total effort at Monteith which we mentioned a while ago but didn't say much about. I mean "experience" or maybe I should say "experiences." These are curricular experiences which particularly in the social sciences we attempt to provide for our students. Perhaps Miss Cassidy might say something about the introduction and function and actuality of these experiences as part of the educational program in our college.

Cassidy: The experiences have been of two major kinds: first, rather partial experiences of attempting to look carefully at slices of ordinary life; looking at children, for example, when one is reading about children; interviewing mothers and children when one is reading about socialization; attempting in other words to get a concrete, empirical sense of what we are reading, and not only a conceptual one. This concern with experience has moved to another phase now. The students are attempting a full research project, an exceedingly modest one, but nevertheless one in which they move from the statement of the problem to some sort of report on what they have found. This type of experience allows the student to test for himself some of the dilemmas of the social science about which he is reading, some of the difficulties of handling data, the inaccuracies of reporting, the difficulties of an analysis, the ambiguity of the responses. This type of research experience we think is a very useful complement to the various experiences of pluralities of conceptualization which we provide in the readings and in the discussions, not every reading being discussed the same way. The students are getting also a plurality of research ex-

perience: observation, interviewing, testing. We hope that little by little they will build up a certain sophistication in handling social science material.

Stern: Allow me to contribute something which occurred to me when Mr. Pope said that we intend the discussion group to be the heart of the educative process at Monteith. One of the techniques for realizing this goal is to allow the discussions to be very free (at least in the natural sciences), very open, following the lead of the dialectic; that is, to follow the thread of the argument wherever it leads and to continue to bring the student back to the subject matter which is the basis of the discussion both in the exams which are program-wide and in the lectures which are given to all the students assembled together. Parenthetically, I think it a neat trick to tape all the lectures, as we have, so that the students can listen to them either again or for the first time at their leisure. The advantage of letting the discussion develop in its own logical sequence, is to allow a great deal of material to enter spontaneously either from other courses of the students or from the specialized background of the instructors. However, since the students realize they will be held responsible for a certain core of material, they are led to converse with other students about what has happened in their discussion sections. This occurs (from all reports) both in the Student Center and elsewhere.

Coral: It seems to me we have been won over in part to Mr. Pope's description of the ideal college as being the place where a conversation takes place among intellectuals and that now we have added to our band of intellectuals the students in the college. I haven't heard recently any strong dissent to your view that a prime purpose in the Monteith program is to achieve this goal of a conversation in a style to be uniquely that of Monteith. I'd like to ask you what role you see the Monteith Center playing in helping us achieve this goal.

Pope: The Monteith Center, located as it is directly adjacent to the Monteith faculty office building, already constitutes, I think, a kind of campus within a campus. Its purpose is to provide a physical focus for an intellectual community made up of both students and faculty; it is a kind of base of operations on the campus for many of our students and a kind of home away from home for some of them. In my mind, the Monteith Center represents the most direct attack which we are making on the problems of mass higher education and we are doing it at a commuting university where the obstacles to a student finding his own identity as a student apart from his own home or neighborhood environment are greater than would be encountered at many other universities. It is not just by providing another eating or recreational facility on campus that we are doing this, but by making what goes on at the Monteith Center an integral part of the whole educational offering of Monteith, and for this same reason we hope that someday we might also have our own classrooms and dormitories in order to better achieve these ends. Even as it is, the physical dimensions of the present Monteith Center may soon be too small for it to fulfill the functions we have in mind.

The vitality of the Center can be judged, I suppose, partly in terms of the number of discussions, debates, seminars and meetings that take place there and which enable the faculty to reveal themselves as committed persons to various intellectual or political positions in ways which it might not be easy for them to do in the formal curriculum. In addition to these semi-formal activities, however, I think it is also very necessary when discussing the Center to look beneath the surface a bit in order to see how it functions to build cohesion in the College. I read an article the other day in the *American Sociological Review* on the role of card playing in the formation of primary groups. Certainly one of the functions of the Center is that it provides an opportunity for students to get to know the same students with whom they attend classes. These friendships, or primary groups, if you will, together form a structure, a set of lines of communication along which ideas can travel. I think there is a process here of the formation of a student culture which is very important and which, remarkable as it is already, cannot be judged solely by its fruits of the moment. At the present time we have only freshmen students, so that the gap between faculty and students has been greater than it will be a few years from now. In an effort to bridge this gap some members of the faculty have, in a sense, played the role of older students and have been, to some extent, informal leaders as well as models of what an intellectual looks like for these freshmen. In fact, these faculty members have taken their obligations to the Monteith Center as seriously as they have taken their obligations to their courses. There are fine lines to draw here but those between the formal curriculum and the forms of discussion which occur in the center have not been rigid. On a number of occasions when regular discussion sections have actually met in the Center, other students have been drawn into the discussion which has then lasted long past the sacred class hour. On the whole, I think the Monteith Center has contributed to our making an important start towards developing the college into an intellectual community.

Coral: Let me add to that. Perhaps you underestimate the extent to which, at this point, the Center has begun to function in something like the fashion we hope it will. A mere catalog of the number of events, some of which you have mentioned, which have taken place in the Center I think is impressive. Some of these were scheduled in advance, some were impromptu. When David Riesman lectured in the social science course he came over to the Center and spent an hour and a half in what I thought was a most enthusiastic give and take with the students. A visiting French journalist, through the medium of an interpreter, had quite a conversation with our students in the Center about the problems of French youth and about Algeria. Our students frequently stay down or come down for an evening meeting in order to meet with and talk with or carry on a conversation with a speaker who either happens to be on campus or who is visiting the Center. The most recent example has been Harold Taylor's visit to the Center.

Drury: Both Mr. Coral and Mr. Pope I must accuse of being ungenerous to themselves. In your portrayal of the Student Center it seems to me you have left out the most important thing of all. Certainly all of us, as former student leaders and as teachers, as people not without organizational know-how, are tempted every now and then to "take over" the Student Center. We know how, ideally, it should go. The important thing, I think, is that we have not. The most important thing about the Student Center is that we have protected the future. Surely we may project and dream about lectures, discussion, bridge-whist tournaments, intellectual discussions, dormitories, and the rest, but the important thing is that we have abstained in the present from setting up and imposing an all too easily structured vision of the future. We have not contradicted that freedom which we have respected in discussions.

Stern: Some of the student creations have amusing aspects. The most recent one, the "cultural" committee, whose name reminds me of either a Marxist study group or a Helen Hokinson cartoon, has been formed in response to student dissatisfaction with the Center as simply a lounge. This group having prepared lists of topics they wish to discuss are now seeking faculty members to talk with them about these topics. This continual harassment in the form of invitations is surely a good sign.

Cassidy: One thing occurred to me when Mr. Drury was talking about self-restraint. To me there is evidence of a gratifying feeling on the part of the students that they can, in a sense, speak up for themselves. I have received com-

mittees of students petitioning to remain in a certain professor's class. I have received students suggesting that the presentation of a particular project might have been phrased in a different way. There seems to be a participation in which the student is thinking through his own educational experience, and to me this is quite astonishing. This all started, I suspect, with the initial interview at which the evaluation group asked students why they were coming to Monteith and what they expected to get out of it. It seems to have geared up their interests immediately and perhaps put aside some of the ambiguity of the situation. I hope they will continue to develop awareness of this sort.

Drury: There is a part of Monteith that ought to be presented here. I once heard Archibald MacLeish refer in a lecture to "the solitary man," the only man, he said, that poetry knows. And I think I might say this to those who are interested in "core groups," cohesions, and comings together, that if this were the only thing we said, we would not be indicating the presence of something which has always been edifying to me at Monteith, namely, the insistence by my colleagues upon the respect, inherent in any serious respect for freedom, for the solitary person, the "genius," to go his own way. At Monteith we think also of the teacher and the professor as somebody who can get out of the way, as somebody who, instead of hanging around and keeping conversation from taking place, can realize this, too, and act accordingly.

Coyal: I think that could stand as a wonderful definition of the good professor—one who knows how to get out of the way of the student.

Pope: I suppose, having started this discussion with my paper, I may claim the privilege of saying the closing words. Not only are the students talking back, so to speak, but I think more of them are beginning to participate in more kinds of discussions: in political discussions, which we haven't seen much of for some time, and also in educational discussion. They arrive here rather frightened by the idea of an experimental college and then pretty soon they are clamoring to get into the act. Personally, I look forward to the day when students will take a real part in the formation of educational goals for Monteith, as well as in the realization of goals set by the faculty. Of course, in any institution with which I have ever been acquainted there has been a core of people who have been more involved, and an often somewhat larger group of people who have been less involved. We have that here, in that much of the "student culture" to which I referred before is being created by some students more than it is by others. On the other hand, there are a number of different types of students who seem to be attracted to Monteith and I hope we can provide a place for most of them. I think Mr. Drury's "solitary man" will always find his place; but if I thought he couldn't, I would certainly try to do something about it. The notion of plurality of experience or of types of conversation or what have you, which Miss Cassidy emphasized earlier, is one which we have certainly tried to enshrine in our program in a number of ways. We emphasize class discussion as a major part of our program, for example, and there is a surprising variety of discussion styles among different instructors. I hope we never lose this plurality and, in building up our own distinctive traditions and perhaps our own distinctive style of conversation, that we never lose the ability to talk in a universe of discourse which is outside of our own particular college or discipline.

About Monteith

(Concluded from Page Four)

The Social Science staff includes, in addition to Sally Cassidy (Sociology), the following persons: George Drury (Philosophy), Kenneth Feigenbaum (Psychology), Andrew Gunder Frank (Economics), Gerald Hickey (Anthropology), Martin Orans (Anthropology), Richard Pope (Anthropology), Lawrence Schlesinger (Social Psychology), Robert Thomas (Anthropology), Paule Verdet (Sociology), and Rolland Wright (Social Psychology). In addition, Gabriel Breton (Psychology) and Carol Ballingall (Anthropology) give their part-time services, and the latter will be involved also in Monteith's Library Project, to be mentioned shortly. George Rawicke (History will join the staff this fall.

Richard Schell and Mrs. Nola Tutag function in the College as student advisers. To manage the business affairs of the College, Mrs. Patricia Knapp was appointed Executive Secretary of the College, but she retains a half-time appointment on Wayne's Library staff. Mrs. Knapp has managed the multitudinuous details of College business with brilliance as well as efficiency, but it was no secret to us that what principally induced her to join the Monteith experiment was her hope of realizing in Monteith certain long-cherished plans for making the University library a more effective part of the process of undergraduate education. It is therefore a source of immense satisfaction to all in Monteith that she has obtained from the United States Office of Education a grant of $80,000 to be expended in the next two years upon an imaginative project of this kind, one which should provide a most effective instrument in helping the student to achieve intellectual independence.

No catalogue of the Monteith staff can be considered complete which does not include the names of the faithful Monteith secretariat: Mrs. Gloria Fisher, who has been with the program since its chrysaloid days as the Committee on General Education, Mrs. Diane Grainger and Mrs. Doris Hodges.

Monteith Facilities

The building at 5165 Second Avenue has been set aside as the Monteith Student Center, and has been appropriately furnished for this purpose with funds from the Foundation grant. Such a center played an important role in the original conception, as providing a locus where the concept of "the small college within the large university" might be fostered and where an important but informal part of the Monteith educational process might go forward. In this first and somewhat confused year of its operation, the Monteith Center has already been used in significant ways for this purpose and in it Monteith students have had opportunities for conversation and discussion with David Riesman, Harold Taylor, Harry Golden, and many others.

The Monteith Center building also houses the director and executive secretary of the College and will provide offices for the humanities staff. The remainder of the staff will be housed, by the time this issue of ***Graduate Comment*** appears, in the building at 631 Merrick Avenue, which the University has just remodelled.

Before ending this cursory account of Monteith College, its inception, and first year of existence, an important point remains to be made. The large pattern which was laid down by the planners of the experiment represents a guide to whose broad outlines the College may be expected to adhere. But within these broad outlines there remains plenty of scope for variation, and undoubtedly the aspect of the College will alter under the impact of the many minds which assemble in the College staff to play upon the main theme. The ideas which are expressed in the papers which follow this essay will suggest the kinds of new directions and new emphases upon which Monteith may embark.

DIALOGUE, COLLOQUIUM, CONVERSATION

by SALLY WHELAN CASSIDY

You probably realize that we count heavily on the discussion group in Monteith. Why is this? Is it simply a matter of class size? Is it so that instructors can keep track of students more easily? Is it so that experiments such as the sociometric one may be carried out more efficiently? Is it to capitalize on the friendliness of the small group or on the personality of the instructor?

Surely we are less concerned with these attributes of the group than we are with the discussion which takes place in it. And yet what is so unique about discussion that we count so heavily upon it? Is it so different from reading, lectures, field work? In a way it is not, inasmuch as you discuss (at least mentally) with your author, lecturer and respondent or culture, but in the discussion group you can practice that great intellectual art, the dialogue.

The archetype of the dialogue is undoubtedly the Socratic one. Whitehead has said that later philosophy was really only footnoting Plato, so we might say that later teaching is only wheeling around the dialogue, now stressing the aspect of controversy and diversity of position, at another time emphasizing the steady progression in the examination of a problem, now highlighting the crucial role of the teacher, later pointing to the meshing of homely example and subtle, demanding analysis.

All of these elements are called into play as we discuss. We do it more or less ably, more or less explicitly, more or less artistically, but our discussion is geared to approximate, in its own milieu and way, the great inquiries which Socrates and his students had in Athens, that Pico della Mirandola had in the hills overlooking Florence, that Johnson had in the Cheshire Cheese, that William James had in Cambridge, that Virginia Woolf and Beatrice Webb had in London, that to this day scholars constantly have with their students in laboratory and study.

Dialogues can be great exalting experiences; they can be frustrating in their clumsiness, their circularity. We said that dialoguing is an art, something which has its particular demands and limits, something which the creative imagination can transform into an experience of breathtaking importance.

The dialogue resembles Navaho sandpainting or better still the Commedia dell' Arte in its particular quality of being created by those present, being irreproducible, unique in each of its expressions. The sandpainting intricate, careful, sacred in intent, is brushed away after it has played its part in Navaho ritual. The actors in the Commedia dell' Arte create their drama from minimal directions by calling on their unique experience, contemporary issues, the inspiration of the minute to produce together the particular drama of that day, that hour. The dialogue, like these, like a great feast, is an achievement which lives on in the memories of those who have participated as the one transcendent hour or experience in a lifetime of humdrum routine.

How do we lend ourselves to this creation of the moment? The dialogue is supremely an attempt at understanding, at the convergence or concurrence of minds and feelings at a particular moment on some issue. Each participant brings to it his reading and interpretation, his total experience of family, work, life in society, brings to it his skill and richness of expression, his particular grasp of detail or of form, his particular capacity to analogize, query, polarize, synthesize.

From the problem, the passion to understand, the particular capacities of those present, the dialogue comes to life and takes shape. As jazz musicians taking leaps from familiar springboards of melody improvise something new which calls for both solo and combination playing, so too the dialogue calls for the effort of single individuals to express their understanding of the issue, while also allowing the lighter stacatto repartee of the group. At its height the group's "yes" or "uh' huh" swell the dialogue to a new pitch of interest, much as the "Amens" of Pentecostal worshipers spur choir and minister onto new heights of prayer.

The dialogue allows for two main forms of development; the intuitive leap and the logical march; indeed, frequently these forms suceed each other as insight is tested and logical analysis firms the ground for a new advance. Thus the dialogue opens itself to a broad range of players or participants; the brilliance of one is set off by the care of another; the older, experienced person is enkindled by the enthusiasms and daring of the less mature who in turn is guarded by the wisdom of his elder. This necessary complementarity—some laying the groundwork by insisting that the question be clear, others bringing the scaffolding of what is already known, others adding the unique touches of a unique insight—of the dialogue should reassure us when we are afraid to step in the circle and take our part. The dialogue will be better for our participation if . . .

If what? If we adopt the major posture of the dialogue, trying to understand. This means deftness not bludgeoning; it means meeting an argument for its own sake and not using tactics of shame or silence and consigning to oblivion; it means lending oneself to the play, the thrust of the dialogue by risking one's insight, or one's ignorance. The tale of the Emperor's clothes is an instructive one for a dialoguer. The search for understanding implies a willingness to listen to alternatives: alternatives of evidence coming from as many sources as the experience of the dialoguers can conjure up; alternatives of persuasiveness, the argument of plausibility, of simplicity, of rigor, of proof, of necessity, of virtue.

Implying more than the conventions of politeness and of rules of debate, in a real sense a dialogue is as good as the weakest dialoguer who at any moment can shatter joint creation by an intemperate or inattentive remark, can mar, block, and blur the understanding by obstinancy, pettiness or autism. This is one reason why dialoguing has long been the mark of the civilized man. The civilized man is the person who can draw others out, bring their experience to bear, give them an opportunity to contribute, restating their hesitant remarks so that they themselves can see the next step to take, skillful at initiating dialogue, at lending distinction to discussion.

The dialogue has another advantage in that it is preeminently a public thing. Open discussion is vital to scholarship, a vocation that makes little sense if it does not lead to discussion. Scholars must risk themselves in discussions as farmers must risk their crops to the weather; neither can hope to bring in a harvest without facing their own particular risk. Scholarship grows not by secret coupon-clipping in a bank vault but by contribution to the open debate, giving others a chance to incorporate one's insight, evidence, findings into their dialogue. In this sense, then, the book and the lecture are a gesture at dialogue, in the one case with readers

(Concluded on Page Seventeen)

THE ROLE OF THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY

by SURAJ N. GUPTA

Only a few years ago a former college president had this to say about the American system of education: "What then is the American, this new man, who has taken the peasantry out of farming, whose productivity per worker is by far the highest there is, who is surrounded by the world's best existing systems of communication and transportation? Was this progress made by a people with an inferior educational system? If so, inferior to what? To their own ideals perhaps but to little else."

Today these eloquent words sound rather hollow in view of the Russian superiority in space technology. It is now generally recognized that there is room for improvement in our educational system, and our shortcomings cannot be dismissed merely by claiming that the needs of the American and Russian peoples are different. Fortunately the United States is still ahead of every other country in science and technology as a whole, but it will not be easy to maintain this supremacy in years to come.

I would especially like to discuss the role of the American universities in the present situation. An American university these days has become a very complex organization. But still the main functions of the university are (a) to provide mass education to the American youth in such a way that it would be beneficial to them as individuals and as members of a progressive society, and (b) to carry on advanced instruction and research in various fields of human knowledge.

The American system of mass education at the university level is indeed the envy of other nations. It is generally believed in European and Asian countries that mass education is one of the basic factors which has contributed to the great material progress of the United States. The Russians have been fully aware of this fact, and they are trying their best to surpass the Americans in large scale higher education.

It has become increasingly clear in recent years that our present system of mass education needs rejuvenation, and that there is an urgent need to raise the standards of university instruction in all fields of knowledge. This does not, however, mean that there is something intrinsically wrong with the American system of higher education or that the Russian satellites prove the superiority of their system. In fact, right now there is a danger that by aping the Russian pattern we may have put too much emphasis on the needs of the society and forget about the needs of the individuals. Thus, we may turn out well-trained teachers, engineers, nurses, et cetera, who have learned skills which are beneficial to the society but are not much use to them as individuals.

An educated man should be able to express himself not only correctly but also gracefully. He should be trained not only in scientific logic but also in aesthetics. He should be interested not only in the problems of daily living but also in the philosophy of life and death. There is a great need to strengthen our mass education in this respect because we come across so many individuals who are highly successful professionally but are failures in their private lives. Even a prosperous and powerful country cannot survive too long if its inhabitants are individually unhappy and discontented.

It is neither possible nor desirable that all American universities should follow exactly the same pattern, and the relative emphasis on mass education and other activities will naturally vary in different universities. But it is not possible for any university to confine itself almost exclusively to mass education. Such a university cannot attract or retain outstanding professors, and even mass education cannot be provided by a second-rate faculty. In order to teach a subject most effectively it is necessary for a professor to know a great deal more than what he is teaching. Every student must also have some contact, even if it is a brief one, with a distinguished scholar to know personally how a creative mind works. That is why most reputable universities insist that a portion of its undergraduate teaching must be done by its most gifted faculty members.

Although I am aware of some exceptions, usually only a professor, who has been engaged in creative activity in his field, can impart a certain excitement to his subject. Students who never come into contact with such a professor feel that a person has to be an egghead or queer in some other way to find knowledge exciting. They feel bored with intellectual pursuits, and in later life they carry this intellectual boredom with them wherever they go.

Along with mass education an American university also carries on advanced instruction and research in various fields of human knowledge. The university research workers can be broadly divided into two groups. Some of them are technicians while others are intellectuals. A technician is one who has amassed a large body of knowledge or has acquired a highly developed special skill. An intellectual, on the other hand, is engaged in the pursuit of knowledge and truth, and he may devote himself, for instance, to exploring the basic laws of nature or understanding the behavior of the human mind or contemplating on the future of mankind. One might say that a technician is one who knows, while an intellectual is one who understands what he knows. Some persons, of course, are technicians as well as intellectuals. It is comparatively easy to recognize the usefulness of a technician to the society, but the social benefits of the work of an intellectual are sometimes difficult to understand.

It is no secret that there is widespread anti-intellectualism in the United States, and those who do not care too much for intellectual activities may ask, "Who is a true intellectual and how are we to distinguish him from eccentrics and false prophets?" It is not quite easy to answer this question, and often there is a genuine difficulty in appreciating the work of a great mind. The strange situation is that even when an intellectual, say a scientist, comes up with some profound and original idea which is widely acclaimed and accepted by other scholars, Americans are reluctant to appreciate his genius and reward him adequately in terms of money, power or honor. In fact, there seems to be a feeling that a man with extraordinary mental power is already amply favored by nature, and that it would be unfair to give him any further advantages over his fellow men. This attitude is not only ridiculous but also dangerous, because no nation can continue to make progress without the new ideas and discoveries of its intellectuals. It should also be remembered that in the past the United States has relied heavily on the talents of European-born intellectuals, but Europe is no longer in a position to fulfill the American needs to the same extent. We are now in competition with a nation which is not lacking in natural resources, and we shall, therefore have to cultivate fully our intellectual resources too. The main responsibility here lies with our universities.

THE BAPTISM OF ART

by LEO KIRSHBAUM

According to E. Royston Pike's ***Encyclopedia of Religion***, "the underlying idea [of baptism] is the washing away of sin, of moral evil, as a preparation for the rite of communion with the Diety by whose death and resurrection the initiate is assured of a life beyond the grave; sometimes as in Christianity, it symbolizes dying to the old life of sin and rising again into the new life that death cannot touch." It is the sacrament, instituted by Jesus, whereby one is admitted into that body of holy men, the Church.

It will be the underlying premise of this paper that art cannot and should not substitute for religion, that when attempts are made to do so confusion of a rather serious and complex nature results.

I should begin by defining my terms. By religion I understand the process by which one saves one's soul. Whatever "process" means, whatever "soul" means, whatever "saving" means, religion constitutes the method by which one rises to a better life, in this life—and beyond this life usually. It entails the notion that man is a special being among the inhabitants of this earth, that because of his make-up he enjoys or can enjoy a relationship with the Godhead. This relationship is not natural in the sense of occurring inevitably, like birth and death. It usually includes some personal effort on the part of the practitioner (this being made alone and/or through the organization which is the Church): and the act of enlightenment usually implies some change in one's ***spiritual*** life. This is a tricky term, ***spiritual***. It covers all sorts of things: perception, morality, activity, ***et cetera***. I suppose what it really says is that man as a ***spiritual*** being enters into his inheritance ***as a man***—who should not be construed merely as another breeding animal adapting himself physically to his environment. So much, for the moment, on religion, the defining of which in my temerity I hope you will understand and forgive.

Now what about art? The etymological meaning can throw much light on the debasement of the term through the centuries. Originally it only meant "skill" — skill in any human activity. And its original meaning holds today not in the word ***artist*** but in the word ***artisan***, a maker. To this day in many a civilized and uncivilized region of the world neither the ***artist*** nor his ***activity*** is regarded as unique, as apart from the normal activities of the individual and his group. He makes things which are both utilizable and beautiful, and no clear-cut distinctions exist between the two appreciations, which in our particular civilization appear to be separate: for us, ***here*** is the ***artist*** who makes our fine pottery for display in the living room cabinet, and ***there*** is the ***artisan***, perhaps a worker on an assembly line, who makes the bowl in which we beat our eggs for breakfast.

Now that we have roughly defined our terms, let us go on. Very, very often art appears in the service of religion. It devises masks, it makes statues, it builds temples, it lays mosaics, it writes poetry for ceremony and arranges dances for feasts. The two impulses in man go so strongly together that there is a tendency to think of the beautiful and the good as one or as inseparable. Plato for one merged them, and he has had a tremendous influence on succeeding ages. But I think the immediate origin of our present-day messy thinking on the subject was that great movement called the Renaissance. Here we get (as in Sidney's ***Defense of Poetry***, 1586) the first loud affirmation of the artist as priest, he who will lead us out of the wilderness. Here we get the reiterated statement that the reading of books, especially poetry, the listening to music, the observation of architecture, painting, and sculpture will save our souls: that you will become good through the beautiful. (Think of Michelangelo's Sistine Chapel, if you wish.) If one is cognizant of the death of religion in fifteenth century Italy, one can say that the Italian humanists substituted art for religion as an approach to a God in which they no longer believed, substituted art appreciation for prayer: pagan self-help for Christian abnegation and intense desire to know and hear God.

Despite the tremendous ballasting movements known as the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation, the humanists won out. Europe was no longer one Christian community with one Christian head, the Pope. It was broken up into separate states and separate sects and churches. The ideal of the learned courtier or gentleman gradually replaced the notion of the unknown saint. And art replaced religion as the way to the good. In the eighteenth century, supernaturalism was frowned upon by the Enlightenment. Virtue was a rational endeavor, and God became a rational bookkeeper, who when not busy keeping records was a superb scientist. In the nineteenth century an interesting inverse process commences in Western Civilization. Art begins producing its own saints, those who preach in the industrial waste of the machine age, the industrial waste of stricken cities, of man turned into a robot at machines, of widespread ugliness and moral fatigue: Art produces as an antidote to all this a Baudelaire, a Rimbaud, a Gauguin; a Shelley, a Matthew Arnold, and an Oscar Wilde; a Melville and a Whitman — saints' voices crying in the wilderness that we must and should turn to beauty or else we perish. Or a Thoreau, or Emerson, or Irving Babbitt, without much reference to beauty, and certainly without pointing to the aid of organized religion, insists that we must save our souls. But the loudest of all is the clarion call of the advocates of the so-called liberal arts, the inheritors of the humanistic tradition.

And so today we have the phenomenon of a Hutchins' University of Chicago or a Wayne State Monteith College. And any day I expect to be stopped by a Monteith student and asked, "Are you washed in the blood of the Lamb?"

Can art substitute for religion? I don't think so. Can we save our souls through education? I don't think so. Does going to college, even Monteith, make us morally or spiritually better? I don't think so. Has the confusion of art and religion had momentous consequences? Yes. Have the results been on the whole good? I don't think so.

Let us return to the purpose of religion for a moment. If it means anything at all, the religious experience must be a supra-human one. Morality is not religion. Living a good life, however commendable, is not being religious. To have religion there must be a mysterious relationship between God and the individual. This is the essence of the Judaeic-Christian tradition, as Luther tried to say to a largely unlistening world. There may, there should be, after baptism and the realization of baptism, a spiritual rebirth which will have results in our attitude and acts toward our fellow creatures.

Art says, "I, too, am mysterious. No one quite knows what I am, or why people regard me passionately. Live in me and be reborn. Let me change your life. I'm sure there will be important moral and spiritual consequences." Thus

says art.

And art-as-religion, whether its preachers and practitioners recognize the above, is the order of the day. Hence, college teachers who are bitter against our materialistic civilization and preach the liberal arts. Hence literary and art critics who deplore bad art and bad taste, and who insist that America, particularly the mid-west, is arid of culture. Hence, novelists like Henry James, Sinclair Lewis, Dreiser, Hemingway, *et cetera,* who in one way or another proclaim the peculiar dessication, boredom, lack of refinement of American life. Hence, the painter like Jack Levine, who is satirist; or conversely, hence the painter like Mark Tobey, who turns his back on reality and presents in abstractions the private symbolism of his soul.

I find the present-day New York art critic, or the midwestern academic critic of poetry or literature in general, or the Californian beatnik reacter (like Henry Miller, say) rather sadly amusing in their romanticism. They are extremely poor in history. And they are quite confused in their aims.

There never has been a time, probably, when a whole culture had a superb scale of values, from which art sprang to take its place in all walks of life, among all people, informing them adroitly and directly in all their actions, spiritual, moral, practical. Our modern critics had better read Plato, or Horace and Juvenal, or Dante, or ***Piers Plowman,*** or Ben Jonson when they get romantic about the artistic charms of the past. Always there has been much ***kitsch,*** always most people have moved from birth to death untouched by the so-called finer things.

Laments about the dangers of mass culture are nonsense. Behind the lament is snobbery, the caressed feeling that only certain individuals are capable of appreciating the finer things: that if you let the horde in, everything will ultimately be reduced to rock-and-roll. Such critics forget that Aeschylus and Shakespeare and Moliere wrote plays for the masses and were sustained by them. I don't think that yet any culture-historian or culture-sociologist has been able to measure or theorize about the vast revolution in American reading habits being caused by cheap paperbacks. There is better introductory criticism in a *Laurel* (35¢) or *Pelican* (50¢) Shakespeare play than there is in most college texts of Shakespeare. And in an average drugstore one can for a dollar go all the way from ***Homer*** to ***Lolita.***

If the atom bomb doesn't pulverize them, most people will escape both existentialist neurosis and the art-religion neurosis. They will work, raise their families, worry about their children as they have always done. Art will always be a part of their lives—whether good art or bad art—in their reading, their furniture, their pictures, their homes, their TV programs, their music. They will be right in seeing both today's creator and critic as displaced, as abnormal. But they will have more sympathy for the former, the creator, because he creates, he makes; they will know that the bitter life of a Modigliani, a Pascin, a Frank Lloyd Wright, a Louis Sullivan is the price the maker of art has to pay in this work-a-day world—that he has to be an exile—like Ovid or Dante or Hemingway. They, the public, will probably never listen ***at the time*** to the critic. However, Dr. Johnson trusted their ultimate good taste. And perhaps in time the spade-work of the alienated critic does bear fruit in the public's appreciation as with Melville, or with Mallarme, or with Matisse.

I see in Detroit today a great cultural awakening. I don't think our art critics or literary critics have had much to do with this renaissance. In fact, I know of no greater enemy of culture than the preacher of culture. He makes Culture with a capital "C" look austere, remote, esoteric, snobbish. And very, very often your preacher of culture, of cultural values, is such a mess, emotionally, morally, and socially, in his own private and public life, that he stands as a living reproach to the way of art-as-religion. I think people recognize this. An emotionally immature college teacher, thundering from the heights about art and culture, can do incalculable harm to the cause he professes.

Well, now, after all these generalizations, you want a program—must have a program. I shall try to do my best!

Do not try to substitute art for religion. The man sitting next to you on the bus reading nothing better than the comics in the ***Detroit Times*** may already have found his way to God. The housewife who has lain on the couch in psychoanalysis may have found out more about herself and others than Henry James ever knew. Do not go to art to find out what you are—to novels, or poetry, or essays. The information you gain there may become a smoke screen hiding you from yourself. You must go within, go lonely, and tired, and depressed. There is no shorter way. Art—books, paintings, music, et cetera--will make, can make, your life momentarily happier, generally happier. They will not make you a good man. To be such you have to go inside to come outside, wide. Don't let Hemingway or Jack Kerouac or T. S. Eliot investigate your soul for you. Do your own work. Find your own God. And be sure that you have not confused an idol who deserves momentary genuflection with the God of Israel, or of St. Paul, or of John Calvin.

Avoid the peril of thinking that education will make you carefully informed, will improve your taste, will make you more psychologically acute. This I would call the Humanist heresy or fallacy. Real education begins after academic education stops. Unfortunately, many do not realize this. All that college usually does is to give you someone else's reactions, someone else's opinions, someone else's information. After listening to this someone else and repeating what he says, you don't have an education. You only have a diploma. The question is: What do ***you*** think of Socrates? (I myself think I understand why the Athenian elders condemned him: He, haughty in his humility, advocated a homosexual community of semi-fascistic oligarchs whom he called philosophers.) What do ***you*** think of Picasso? (I myself think many of his paintings are repetitional bores.) What do ***you*** think of Beethoven? (I myself think the last movement of the Ninth an ascent into luminous bathos.)

Try to spread the pleasure which comes from art throughout your daily lives. In the morning, don't turn on WWJ; turn on CBE. You will likely hear some music—I don't say worth listening to (that is snobbery)—I mean you will likely hear some music that won't bore you. Don't buy an automobile that looks as though it were designed by Tinsel Incorporated. Buy furniture not for its price but for its functional utility and beauty. Buy reproductions of your favorite painter and put them on the walls of your room. Go to the usual bad movie only when you're so bored you don't care what's on the screen. Buy records of Mozart, Bach, and Puccini rather than the latest transitory blast of the Harlem Globetrotters; even in jazz one can be discriminating. On the whole, when it comes to books, because you have limited time, don't buy the latest masterpiece acclaimed by ***Time*** magazine. Read the classics. (My stars, what a wonderful world Euripides, for one, unfolds! Most people just know Sophocles' ***Oedipus the King.*** If you want to know further about the pain and glory of Greek tragedy, read Euripides' ***The Bacchae.*** What a terrible portrait of the Catholic Middle Ages you will find in John Ciardi's pocket book version of the ***Inferno*** — a Middle Ages quite different from that drawn by Maritain or Gilson, or even Christopher Dawson! Or how delicately Henry James understood America and Europe in ***Daisy Miller.***) In other words, don't relegate art to visits to the art museum or to Sunday concerts. Spread it through your daily lives.

When anyone suggests that you really ***must*** see Playhouse 90 on your TV, insist on turning on, instead, the hockey or baseball game. In other words, avoid art enthusiasts. (You can find them every evening getting soused on Woodward

Avenue; the drunker and messier they get, the louder they advocate the beauty and morality of the artistic life, and the harder their knees press yours under the table.) Insist on your franchise in the world of art. Don't let any teacher or friend take it away from you. Like what you want to like, dislike what you want to dislike. Now this does not mean that I want you to be careless or wanton in your opinions. I merely mean that ultimately, after savoring, after studying, after learning (perhaps from a teacher) you at last come to your own independent conclusions.

Along with the above, be relaxed about art. On the whole, I myself avoid concerts because I can't take off my shoes. An art experience is not necessarily good because it is somber and formal. Part of loving art is living with it, just as one lives with a wife, not always on the heights. To love art properly is to take it somewhat for granted. If the fire engine goes by while the Debussy quartet is on, feel free to run to the window. But to be at ease is not necessarily to be slovenly. Art is often a fruit that requires lengthy and careful attention before its greatest amount of juice can be extracted. What I am saying is that you don't have to wear formal attire to eat a dish of strawberries.

Patronize the artists in your own immediate community. At least, look at their work. If you have to wait for advice from art magazines before you cough up five bucks or fifty bucks for a painting, an etching, a footstool, a record—you're not really interested in art. You're just trying to keep up with the Joneses.

Make your own art. Now note I am not advising you to cash in on your father's government bonds and take the next banana boat to Paris. Nor am I suggesting that you grow a beard and hole up in the attic while learning to write *great* music or *great* poetry or *great* short stories or *great* novels, to paint *great* pictures, or to chip *great* marble statues of Jove. For one thing, you don't have time; you probably have to study for an Econ exam, and you're probably already two weeks behind in your room rent and have to work evenings and week ends. It is the yen for *great* art that keeps so many people from being what they should be: artists, or if you wish, artisans. As long as you don't fool yourself or bedevil yourself about the importance of what you are doing, learn how to model clay, to daub nice lean canvas with color constructs, to write poems that seem to have neither rhyme nor reason, nor even grammar and correct spelling, but do express your feelings—to tinkle out originals on the piano or guitar, to imagine that Martha Graham of Jose Limon are there and to dance with them to Stravinsky's *Rites of Spring*. It is, is it not, shameful that a factory worker who does over his basement or puts on a new roof is closer to the practicing artist than you are? He is handling things, feeling them, seeing them, arranging them, hearing them as he tightens and hammers. In an elementary fashion he is learning about art through making; he is learning about design, materials, tools, et cetera. He is using his senses to be a maker, that is, an artist. And much about the high-falutin view of art as well as of the vulgar view of art would be removed if people themselves became artists. All artists are intense in their sensations. Learn to see, to touch, to smell, to hear, to move with attention and devotion. If all else fails, you can always remodel that monstrosity of a table that Aunt Josephine left the family into something rich and strange, by the use of saw, varnish remover, plastic wood, and a can of paint. Or if you have no Aunt Josephine, redo your bedroom walls a la Mondrian into oblongs and squares of orange and violet. Or write poems to Barbara C. Of course, they probably will be awful, but their composition will teach you something about poetry that twenty lectures cannot teach you; and besides, you will be in the same category, for the moment, with Racine and Wordsworth!

And this is most important of all to both maker and viewer. Don't try to be ***right***, with a capital ***R***! Art is ultimately for enjoyment, not the salvation of souls. Don't try to save your own soul through art. Of course, saving your soul should be your prime consideration while on earth. But since I don't quite know what ***soul*** is, since I don't quite know how to save my own, since I myself am beginning to sound like a priest or clergyman or rabbi, I had better keep my mouth shut and let you mind your own business.

Dialogue, Colloquium, Conversation

(Concluded from Page Thirteen)

far away, or as yet unborn, in the other case with silent auditors without the joy of a response which would allow one to advance farther.

But the dialoguing spirit also comes into play in listening, in lending oneself to the person who is attempting to convey his understanding of a situation. The same effort at generous response, patient rephrasing to be sure of one's understanding, testing with experience, is needed to get the genuine statement of the other. The dialoguing spirit can lead to what the anthropologist calls the "inside view," or what the social psychologist might term the "definition of the situation," key to a society's culture, a group's way of life.

This, then, is why we stress the importance of the discussion group—because we believe that practice in the art of the dialogue will allow us to develop the experience and art of reflection, and communication will allow all of us to grow in understanding and capacity to work with each other.

IN THIS COMMENT

(Concluded from Page One)

from the University of Cambridge. He came to Wayne State in 1956 as a professor of physics.

Leo Kirschbaum is a professor of English at Wayne State. He was educated at the University of Michigan, and received his Ph.D. there in 1937. His publications are numerous, and at the present time he is commissioned by Meridian Press to do an edition of Marlowe's plays and by the Oxford University Press to do an edition of Ben Jonson's plays. He has lectured in England and Israel. His paper was first presented as a lecture under the auspices of the University Lecture Club at the University on April 11, 1960.

Max Mark is an associate professor in the Department of Political Science at Wayne State. He came to Wayne in 1952 from Western Reserve. Dr. Mark completed his advanced education at the University of Vienna. He spent seven years in China as a part of his escape from Hitler's Europe to this country. He has written many articles on international affairs.

With this issue ***Graduate Comment*** concludes the current academic year. The next issue will appear in October of 1960, and will begin the presentation of the papers delivered during the Third Annual McGregor-DETROIT ADVENTURE Conference, "Art & Culture: Links Between Knowledge and Life in Milan, Italy and Detroit, U.S.A."

The past year has been an exciting one for ***Comment***. Its roster of readers within and beyond the University has grown substantially. Several of its original articles have been reprinted elsewhere. Spending, as we do, public monies to maintain this effort, however, we do especially welcome the reassurance of our readers that we are heading in the right direction. At the conclusion of this publication year, therefore, we solicit your comments and criticisms, and remind you that your manuscripts are welcome here.

W.M.B.

ECONOMICS, SCIENCE, INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

by MAX MARK

There has been a change in international politics. War no longer means what it once did. The physical power of the major nations can no longer be effectively used against one another. In the past, those who proved the stronger in war would gain appreciable advantages, but the emergence of atomic and hydrogen weapons has made war by design, at least among the super powers, an "impossibility." All that physical power can effectively be used for now is the maintenance of a balance of power or, as it has been called, a balance of terror. It cannot be used for the advancement of concrete national aspirations. This situation necessarily must encourage a shift in the character of the competition between nations from the traditional competition in physical power to something else.

What that something else must be--what new sort of international competition must prevail--may perhaps be clearer if we note the sort of political thought from which it must necessarily evolve. The chief political characteristics of the national state seem to follow from two related assumptions: that men owe their ultimate loyalty to their national state and that the well-being of the national state is for its members an end in itself.

At present, national loyalty is fortified by a sense of superiority that every nation feels in regard to every other. Such conflicting senses of superiority are possible because nations do not admit to a commonly accepted basis of comparision, and whatever common areas exist seem intangible and hence not measureable.

Traditionally, this has led to a situation where a nation would compare or, better, contrast its area of strength (true or fancied) with another nation's area of weakness (likewise true or fancied). The Germans, for instance, pointed out to the British that they were a people of poets and philosophers while the British were one of shopkeepers; the British, on the other hand, pointed out to the Germans that they were a people of empire builders while the Germans were one of dreamers. (I chose the more charitable of the comparisons which the two nations would engage in.) The second limitation made it impossible even to judge areas upon whose importance all sides were agreed, as when a nation would say to another nation, "my history is more impressive than yours." (What is an impressive history?) In this respect nations continued the attitudes of religions which likewise base their claims to superiority on nothing else but their assertions.

The external air of superiority was paralleled by the face the nation showed to its own people. Here the attitude was that every citizen, whatever his station in life and however he had fared, should be thankful for having been born into his particular nation and not into any other.

The ultimate test for the claim to superiority was, however, a *tour de force*: war. The ultimate foundation for the internal claims of the nation was its ability to indoctrinate people with them. Hence, in both cases it was power which provided the touchstone. Externally, it was power in its cruder form, physical coercion; internally, in its more subtle form of dominance over people's minds. The mere aspect of subtlety did not necessarily make this dominance legitimate--if legitimacy is considered only that which operates *in the interest* of those who are subject to it. Seen from the standpoint of the individual, interest would have meant contributing to his growth and, incidental to this, something providing the necessary economic security. Traditionally, however, such standards of legitimacy were never admitted by the nation.

The internal claims of the nation were the first to be subjected to challenge. This challenge was connected with the rise of the idea of the welfare state, an idea that began with such questions as, "What does the state do for my economic security and my personal growth?" It should be noted here that a similar test had been applied all along in our own country even prior to the rise of the notion of the welfare state, though this test had never been made a matter of explicit policy before the New Deal. As a frontier country, the United States drew substantial numbers of people from other countries whose goal in their emigration was the improvement of their economic position. Lacking a feudal past, the new nation did not offer "grandeur"; it offered people a chance to pursue economic gain. In so doing the nation equated its mission with that of making opportunities for prosperity available. This mission or assumption found expression in occasional remarks by Americans who, in explaining their love for their country, would say--"because it has been 'good' to me." To the person from Europe this remark sounds, at least initially, strange. For he has been conditioned to love his country without further justification other than that it is his.

Once the notion of the welfare state became generally accepted, a rearrangement of domestic political institutions to serve its purpose got under way. But there were more far-reaching consequences to the preoccupation with economic security and economic growth than that. People were bound to start to compare the respective merits of different economic system. On the other hand, subjecting political institutions to the test of economics was bound to affect the nation state itself. The state itself would be made subject to the test of its economic rationality. This test would be less germaine to a country of great resources and opportunities (provided the political institutions were geared to maximize them) than to smaller nations. Among them the question would have to arise: Is the small or medium size nation state an adequate framework for the pursuit of prosperity and economic security? Is the present economic system doing as much as can be done within the framework?

All these questions are confronting, in the most pointed form, the newly emerging nation of the world. In dealing with them the newly emerging countries are not hampered by any vested interests in one or the other competing economic systems (their economic systems are precapitalist) nor are they hampered by any inherited non-economic test of national goals. Their occasional parading of their "spirituality" should not deceive us. Such parading, coming, as it often does, from their "information" agencies, is a cover up for envy or frustration in coping with their pressing economic problems. In the same light should be considered the boasts of their intellectuals about the past greatness of their countries. What must strike the foreign observer is how little, aside from a few cliches, these intellectuals know about the past of their countries--and their ignorance is simply the result of their indifference. They are accustomed already to measure national greatness in the number of tons of steel produced. In these attitudes the intellectuals stand in sharp contrast to their counterparts in the East-European na-

tional movements of the last century; the older sort, no matter what their occupations were, were learned in the history and tradition of their peoples.

This leads us to the question of the "nationalism" of the newly emerging countries. The term itself has done more to obscure than to enlighten the forces for which it stands. Without going into detail here, can it not be said, that the claims for economic help which these countries make upon the advanced countries resemble more the claims of a proletariat upon an upper class than the claims of one "sovereign" nation upon another? These claims reveal the true character of the new "nationalism" much more than the shrill voices of the street mobs. With such claims and concerns, why should the newly emerging countries be interested in the exhibition of physical prowess by the super powers--and is it not helpful though at times irritating, that they look with some irony upon the physical part of the Great Power competition?

With the emergent nations, the welfare state, and especially with the new nature of power, the whole character of international politics has become transformed. No longer is international politics in essence power politics but it is a politics whose stuff is a competition to get men to believe in the superior merits of one's own economic system. The competition of course is between the United States and the Soviet Union. Different as the two systems are they have one thing in common: the acceptance of a common frame of reference for the competition. This represents a revolutionary change from the past.

What we have at present in the relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union is a combination of a modified competition in power (modified because physical power cannot be used effectively for the advancement of national aspirations nor for the settlement of conflict). The only service of power is to maintain the balance of terror, the balance that permits the competition of economic systems. Perhaps we should note that beyond a certain point the significance of physical power even for the balance of terror is diminished. For once the two opponents have enough physical power to destroy each other, it becomes irrelevant that one can destroy the other twice or three times over. Hence, from having been the central part and central issue of international politics, physical power has assumed a marginal significance (however large it may loom because of the fears of atomic war in the minds of men). Today it provides no more than the umbrella under which a business-like economic competition between the Soviet Union and the United States can proceed. It provides also the umbrella under which the newly independent countries can work at the reconstruction of their societies and it, finally, provides the umbrella under which the integration of countries along the line of economic rationality can take place.

What has been the role of science in these developments? First, it was science which made the orientation toward the abundant life possible. For only after segments of humanity had left the age of scarcity behind--and it was science and technology which accomplished this--could the abundant life for all become a generally accepted value and the notion arise that instead of the war, of all against all for economic security, society could be charged with providing it.

But it was perhaps in relation to war that science--and we are referring here particularly to nuclear science--created a truly revolutionary situation. By making war so destructive nuclear science brought humanity face to face with the irrationality of war in a measure which preceding generations had never experienced. Is it necessary to say that no grain of rationality can be found in the risk of mutual total destruction? By opening up, on the other hand, vistas of unprecedented benefits through the peaceful use of atomic energy nuclear science has thrown the insanity of mutual destruction into still bolder relief.

We have spoken about science. Behind science is the scientist. What about him? The developments we have discussed cast him in a new role. He more than anybody else has the awareness of how great the dangers and opportunities are. He cannot dodge the issues--others can play naive. In the face of the possibilities for total destruction he cannot plead, as his predecessors did, that science is neutral. In finding himself faced with new responsibilities the scientist will find also new opportunities which his predecessors did not have. The awareness of the common danger to humanity, shared by scientists all over the world, carries the seeds for a worldwide fraternity which scholars in other fields cannot hope for. Given the objective character of sciences, this fraternity has no walls in communication. By contrast, the culture-bound character and the idealogical content of social science leads to a situation where social scientists from different societies talk past each other and not to each other.

From this it follows that the customary dichotomy between science and the humanities has become outdated--if ever it was relevant. Science has become the basis for a new humanism. Divorced from the challenges of contemporary science the study of the humanities would often be unable to transcend the narrow loyalties of the nation state.

The rise of a truly universalist humanism may still be far off. There are many obstacles in its way. But a first step toward it has been achieved by the common desire of mankind to *live through*. Coupled with this desire is the fact that the nations of the world have found, for the first time in history, in the general acceptance of the abundant life as their goal and of the development of science as a means, a common denominator other than power for their pursuits which at the same time represents also a common denominator for their competition. This competition may for the time being still have an ethnocentric character in that at least the man in the street will continue to think that by some special dispensation his nation is the chosen one for having the better scientists and the better techniques for economic growth. But as the competition proceeds it will become clear even to the most parochial mind that there are no innate differences among nations in this respect, that differences in excellence are simply a matter of the stage of development of a nation or of an organization, and that among nations of a similar stage of development superiority in one or another field is a matter of selection and concentration. When this does become clear, then the age of universalism will have arrived. If there is to be an alternative to atomic destruction, one can be fairly optimistic about the ultimate outcome as depicted here.

Style of Conversation

(Concluded from Page Six)

a curriculum reform designed to provide a better liberal education component for students who are already committed to the pursuit of one profession or another. Although this may have been one of the reasons for the establishment of Monteith, it need not be the ultimate criterion of its success or failure.

I like it here at Wayne because I believe, for one thing, that our University is ideally suited for this kind of sweeping reform of undergraduate education. More than many other universities, Wayne is a confederation of various autonomous colleges each with its own unique traditions. By emphasizing these traditions, by permitting each college to maintain—even to develop—its own uniqueness especially in the area of undergraduate programs, much can be gained. But even as the students would have much to gain by some degree of isolation from the mass of fellow students by belonging to smaller enterprises, the faculties of these colleges have very much to gain by the advantages of bigness and by belonging to a university-wide intellectual community—sharing common library and research facilities, teaching courses in each other's graduate programs where their own specialties might contribute to those programs. Perhaps in this sense, not as several faculties but as one faculty, Wayne as an intellectual community might continue to develop its own distinctive style of conversation.